

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CURTIS O. JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:13-cv-475

v

HON. JANET T. NEFF

F. HOGLE, et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**OPINION AND ORDER**

Plaintiff filed a Motion for Transfer to a separate facility (Dkt 15), which was referred to the Magistrate Judge. The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (R&R), recommending that this Court deny Plaintiff's Motion for Transfer. The matter is presently before the Court on Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3), the Court has performed de novo consideration of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections have been made. The Court denies the objections and issues this Opinion and Order.

Plaintiff argues that the Magistrate Judge erred in recommending this Court deny the Motion for Transfer (Objs., Dkt 35 at 2-3). According to Plaintiff, a transfer is necessary because Defendants Moran and Nevins are "acting in concert to ignore plaintiff [sic] mental health issues" (*id.* at 2). Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Moran is sexually harassing Plaintiff and

has refused him his medication “without substantial reason,” causing Plaintiff to “suffer irreparable injury by subsequently harming himself or others” (*id.* at 3).

Plaintiff’s objections fail to demonstrate that a result other than the denial recommended by the Magistrate Judge is warranted. The Magistrate Judge correctly analyzed Plaintiff’s Motion for Transfer and fully considered his allegations. The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that Plaintiff fails to establish that he is likely to prevail in this matter, that he would suffer irreparable injury absent injunctive relief, or that public interest would be served by judicial interference in the operations of the correctional facility in this case (R&R, Dkt 33 at 2). Accordingly, this Court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation as the Opinion of this Court. Therefore:

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Objections (Dkt 35) are DENIED and the Report and Recommendation (Dkt 33) is APPROVED and ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion for Transfer (Dkt 15) is DENIED for the reasons stated in the Report and Recommendation.

Dated: February 18, 2014

/s/ Janet T. Neff  
JANET T. NEFF  
United States District Judge